| Date(s) of Assessment: | Project:         |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Assessor(s):           | Review Examined: |
|                        |                  |

|     |  | Y, N, | F, O | Comments |  |
|-----|--|-------|------|----------|--|
| DEX | ZIEW DDEDADATION   | NA    |      |          |  |
| KL  | VIEW PREPARATION   |       |      |          |  |
| 1   | Have standards been identified to clearly define the review process?   |       |      |          |  |
| 2   | Were guidelines used to prepare for the review?  |       |      |          |  |
| 3   | Has the project submitted any request for deviations or waivers to the defined process?  |       |      |          |  |
| 4   | Have entrance and exit criteria been established for the review?   |       |      |          |  |
| 5   | Was an agenda prepared and distributed in advance of the review?   |       |      |          |  |
| 6   | Was the review package provided with ample time to review?   |       |      |          |  |
| 7   | Were the appropriate stakeholders in attendance?   |       |      |          |  |
| REV | REVIEW CONTENT   |       |      |          |  |
| 8   | Were the goals of the review and any review prerequisites provided?  |       |      |          |  |
| 9   | Was the review process addressed, including the method for capturing Requests for Action (RFAs), risks, or issues?             |       |      |          |  |
| 10  | Was status given on action items from the Acceptance Review?   |       |      |          |  |
| 11  | Was status included on action items from all previous software reviews?  |       |      |          |  |
| 12  | Are the pertinent stakeholders involved in approval of the review material?  |       |      |          |  |
| 13  | Was an overview of the software project/system provided (e.g., mission goals, key functionality, operational characteristics)? |       |      |          |  |

Revision: 2.0 Page 1 of 5

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation

For more information, please visit the NASA GSFC Software Assurance Website, at http://sw-assurance.gsfc.nasa.gov.

|     |  | Y, N,<br>NA | F, O | Comments |
|-----|--|-------------|------|----------|
| A   | Was a review/status of top-level requirements and derived requirements provided?   |             |      |          |
| 15  | Was the relationship of requirements to support provided (i.e., typical, critical, special or contingency)?                      |             |      |          |
| 16  | Were organizational interfaces and responsibilities defined?   |             |      |          |
| 17  | Were operational support scenarios identified?   |             |      |          |
| 18  | Were the operational facilities (e.g., hardware environment, network) and their availability identified?                         |             |      |          |
| 19  | Was status provided for all software components?   |             |      |          |
| 20  | Were test summary reports and overall performance results presented?   |             |      |          |
| 21  | Have all requirements been verified?   |             |      |          |
| 22  | Were any workarounds and non-<br>functioning software components<br>identified and documented?                                   |             |      |          |
| 23  | Was the operational problem escalation process presented?  |             |      |          |
| 24  | Was the operational emergency notification process identified including telephone contact numbers?                               |             |      |          |
| 251 | Is there evidence that all software operations personnel are appropriately trained?  |             |      |          |
| 26  | Were security issues presented?  |             |      |          |
| 27  | Were safety issues presented?  |             |      |          |
| 28  | Are there any Configuration Management (CM) issues identified concerning the software operations?                                |             |      |          |
| 29: | Is there evidence that the software is under CM control and change procedures are being implemented as specified in the CM Plan? |             |      |          |

Revision: 2.0 Page 2 of 5

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation

|     |  | Y, N,<br>NA | F, O | Comments |
|-----|--|-------------|------|----------|
| 30  | Is there evidence that all software        |             |      |          |
|     | procedures and associated                  |             |      |          |
|     | documentation is under CM control and      |             |      |          |
|     | change procedures are being                |             |      |          |
|     | implemented as specified in the CM         |             |      |          |
|     | Plan?                                      |             |      |          |
| 31: | Is there evidence that software quality    |             |      |          |
|     | procedures are being implemented as        |             |      |          |
|     | specified in the SQ Plan?                  |             |      |          |
| 32  | <b>~</b> 1                                 |             |      |          |
|     | reviews applicable to the software and     |             |      |          |
|     | the affected system?                       |             |      |          |
| 331 | , ,  |             |      |          |
| ĺ   | and issues documented with plans for       |             |      |          |
|     | tracking and closure?                      |             |      |          |
| SOF | TWARE DOCUMENTATION STATUS                 |             |      |          |
| 341 | Does the review package address the        |             |      |          |
|     | status of software documentation as        |             |      |          |
|     | specified in the project plan?             |             |      |          |
| 35  | 1  |             |      |          |
|     | contingency plans addressed in the         |             |      |          |
| _   | review package?                            |             |      |          |
| 36  | 1  |             |      |          |
|     | documentation (e.g., OPS and               |             |      |          |
|     | Maintenance Plans)?                        |             |      |          |
| 37  | Was status provided for all interface      |             |      |          |
|     | documents with external organizations?     |             |      |          |
|     | T REVIEW ACTIVITIES                        | I           |      |          |
| 38  | At the conclusion of the review is an      |             |      |          |
|     | understanding reached on the validity      |             |      |          |
|     | and degree of completeness of the          |             |      |          |
|     | Operational Readiness Review?              |             |      |          |
| 39  | $\mathcal{C}$ 1                            |             |      |          |
|     | acceptability of the Operational           |             |      |          |
|     | Readiness Review?                          |             |      |          |
| 40  | , , ,                                      |             |      |          |
|     | for actions (RFAs) that require follow-    |             |      |          |
|     | up?  |             |      |          |
| 41  | 1 1  |             |      |          |
| •   | and tracking the closure of risks, issues, |             |      |          |
|     | or RFAs?                                   |             |      |          |

Revision: 2.0 Page 3 of 5

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation

For more information, please visit the NASA GSFC Software Assurance Website, at http://sw-assurance.gsfc.nasa.gov.

|    |                                      | Y, N, | F, O | Comments |
|----|--------------------------------------|-------|------|----------|
|    |                                      | NA    |      |          |
| 42 | Have all artifacts been placed under |       |      |          |
|    | formal configuration control (e.g.,  |       |      |          |
|    | review packages)?                    |       |      |          |
| 43 | Were Lessons Learned addressed and   |       |      |          |
|    | captured?                            |       |      |          |

#### REFERENCE ITEMS/DOCUMENTS

IEEE Standard for Software Reviews, IEEE STD 1028-1997

Managers' Handbook for SW Development, SEL-84-101

Review Definition – The ORR examines the actual system characteristics and the procedures used in its operation and ensures that all flight and ground hardware, software, personnel, procedures, and user documentation accurately reflect the deployed state of the system.

Revision: 2.0 Page 4 of 5

| Date(s) of Assessment:  | Project: |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Assessor(s):            |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
| COMMENTS PAGE of _      |          |
| Comments from assessmen | nt       |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |
|                         |          |

Revision: 2.0 Page 5 of 5

Y=Yes, N=No, NA=Not Applicable, F=Finding, O=Observation

For more information, please visit the NASA GSFC Software Assurance Website, at http://sw-assurance.gsfc.nasa.gov.